DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 882 IR 006 820

AUTHOR Lissit, Robert; And Others
TITLE Summary of Findings and Recommendations on Federal Audiovisual Activities.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Telecommunications Policy, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 78
CONTRACT TP7AC019
NOTE 86p.
AVAILABLE FROM The National Telecommunications and Information Administration, 1800 G Street, N.W., Room 760, Washington, D.C. 20006 (Free)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Agencies; Audiovisual Aids; *Audiovisual Programs; *Expenditures; *Facility Inventory; *Federal Government; Film Production; Media Technology; Training; Videotape Recordings

ABSTRACT

At the direction of President Carter, a year-long study of government audiovisual programs was conducted out of the Office of Telecommunications Policy in the Executive Office of the President. The programs in 16 departments and independent agencies, and the departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force have been reviewed to identify the scope of the government effort, determine whether there is any inefficiency and, if so, to devise ways of improving the situation. The review included personal interviews, visits to government production facilities, budget analyses, film screenings, and videotape showings. Projects and facilities were examined on the basis of written justifications, clearance procedures, procurement systems, utilization, costs, distribution, and evaluation procedures. This summary of the project presents an analysis of the data collected, lists equipment and facilities for the various departments, and recommends processes and procedures for efficient operation of audiovisual activities. Reports from the Departments of Agriculture; Commerce; Defense; Energy; Health, Education, and Welfare; Housing and Urban Development; Interior; Justice; Labor; State; Transportation; and Treasury and from ACTION; Agency for International Development; General Services Administration; and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration are available from the National Telecommunications and Information Administration. (Author/RAO)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED169882

SUMMARY

OF

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ON

FEDERAL AUDIOVISUAL ACTIVITIES

A REVIEW

CONDUCTED BY ROBERT LISSIT

WITH:

CHARLES COATES

NANCY GREENE

JANE LANGE

AUDREY RASMUSSEN

UNDER CONTRACT #TP7AC019 TO THE:
OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY,
AND NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND
INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

APRIL, 1978

IR006820

This report was prepared under a contract with the Office of Telecommunications Policy, Executive Office of the President which, under Reorganization Plan #1 of 1977, has become part of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration.

The views and conclusions contained in this report are those of the author and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration or of the U.S. Government.

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

II. MILITARY PROGRAMS

III. CIVILIAN AGENCIES

IV. PROCUREMENT

V. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

VI. FACILITY INVENTORY, FILMS SCREENED

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

At the direction of President Carter, a year-long study of government audiovisual programs has been conducted out of the Office of Telecommunications Policy, in the Executive Office of the President. A review has been made of the programs in 16 departments and independent agencies, and the departments of the Army, Navy and Air Force. An attempt has been made to identify the scope of the government effort, determine whether there is any inefficiency and, if so, to devise ways of improving the situation.

The review consisted of:

1) Development of policy recommendations for each of the departments and agencies studied. Cooperative consultations were held throughout the period of the study.

2) Development of an audiovisual management circular, in cooperation with OMB.

The review included personal interviews with more than 450 government representatives and spokespersons for private industry and labor unions, visits to government production facilities, review of approvals and budgets for individual audiovisual products, and screening of more than 200 government-produced full length motion pictures, in addition to videotapes, short items such as public service announcements, newsclips and documentation reels.

The review covered audiovisual material produced for internal agency use - training and management communications - and material for public communication. The greatest attention

was paid to motion picture films and to videotape. Projects and facilities were examined on the basis of written justifications, clearance procedures, procurement systems, utilization, costs, distribution and evaluation procedures. Individual audiovisual products were reviewed for technical proficiency and communications effectiveness, and weighed against cost and level of distribution. While evaluation of a motion picture or videotape is often subjective, an attempt was made to help agencies relate cost to quality.

During the course of the review, a number of planned projects were identified where sufficient reason existed to recommend reevaluation to agencies.

The current status of these recommendations is:

Disapproved expenditures:	$4,006,000
Disapprovals recommended, but not yet acted upon:	4,975,647
Savings anticipated from recommended facility consolidations:	3,049,628
Projected Savings:	$12,031,275

In addition, audits were recommended of projects which cost the government $1,737,342, in which there was reason to suspect substantial overcharges or procedures which seemed to run counter to government regulations. One such audit was completed during the course of the review. A film which cost about $125,000 was audited.

The auditors disallowed approximately $25,000 in charges, and asked for further documentation of an additional $7,000.

The new audiovisual management circular, developed in cooperation with the Office of Management and Budget to improve management of audiovisual programs, includes the following provisions:

- Audiovisual products should be used as support tools for specific Government programs, not to promote an agency, or provide forums for agency opinions on broad subjects, without reference to specific programs.
- Agency heads shall designate an office with responsibility for management oversight of audiovisual activities.
- Existing audiovisual facilities shall be consolidated into as few locations as practicable, and underutilized facilities shall be closed down.
- Government employees will not serve as performers in audiovisual productions unless they are doing their own jobs, for training or internal communications, and are not allowed to use prepared scripts.
- In establishing the most cost-efficient way of producing audiovisual material, agencies will consider contracting with private industry where appropriate.
- Before acquiring or producing an audiovisual product,

an agency shall consider communications objectives, production costs, target audience, user cost, life span, frequency of use, method and cost of distribution, and whether another audiovisual product has already been done on the subject.

- The National Audiovisual Center will establish and maintain an index of government audiovisual products which will be checked by agencies before production.
- Reports on individual productions, and annual reports, including all costs, will be prepared by agencies and placed on file with the National Audiovisual Center.
- Out-takes from footage accumulated in production of government audiovisual products will be made available to other agencies and the public through the Audiovisual Archives Division.
- Independent evaluation of a set percentage of audiovisual products shall be made to determine the effectiveness of the products in communicating their intended messages. Evaluations will be on file at the National Audiovisual Center.
- Records will be kept of distribution systems, and how much it costs to reach a given number of people. Distribution reports will be kept on file at the National Audiovisual Center, and will be considered by agencies in developing future audiovisual production.

Recommendations already made to agencies and departments as a part of this review reflect the policies and procedures outlined in the OMB Circular. Several agencies already are at work drafting new procedures to tighten controls. The General Services Administration will provide continuing guidance and monitor implementation of the new procedures.

The issuance of the OMB Circular, the GSA follow-up activity, and recommendations made to departments and agencies, represent an attempt to manage the government's audiovisual programs efficiently, to allow for proper Congressional and public oversight of audiovisual expenditures and, ultimately, to provide the taxpayer with some assurance that he or she is getting value for his or her dollar.

Audiovisual material, by its very nature, has high visibility, is expensive, and has a great potential impact on the viewer. Properly used, it is an important government tool. Improperly used, it can be wasteful, or, worse, result in propaganda.

While adherence to the new guidelines should result in a reduction in waste and inefficiency in government audiovisual activities, the nature of the programs is such that periodic reviews may be necessary to assure continuing management attention.

STEPS TAKEN BY STUDY AGENCIES

Action

Reviewing internal audiovisual procedures and planning to tighten controls.

Agriculture

Completed internal review of audiovisual programs; trying to strengthen Departmental management, to achieve greater cost-effectiveness and wider audience appeal.

Agency for International Development

(Program reviewed separately from Dept. of State.) Has drafted new procedural guidelines to tighten control over audiovisual programs.

Commerce

Has completed new guidelines and established review board to consider all proposals and require greater justification for audiovisual material.

Defense

Considering proposals to improve central management and consolidate production facilities. Refining information system to reduce duplication of effort.

Energy

Procedures being considered for tightening management controls. Department is considering initiation of audiovisual review board.

G.S.A.

Controls tightened over acquisition of video equipment.

H.E.W.

Completing revision of audiovisual management manuals to assure Departmental consistency, bring in line with mission statement, and tighten controls.

H.U.D.

Considering new procedures to bring all Departmental audiovisual programs under central guidance.

Interior

Considering bringing newsclips under Departmental audiovisual procedures; considering tightening controls over video equipment purchases; currently considering the need to alter Departmental guidelines relating to motion pictures.

Justice

Studying the need for consolidation of Washington-area video production facilities.

Labor

Completed inventory of equipment and audiovisual programs, considering proposals to tighten controls, and developing consolidation plan.

NASA

Completing work on new agency procedures providing more centralized management of audiovisual programs.

State

Has completed draft of new procedures to tighten control

over audiovisual activities.

Transportation

Re-drafting manual covering audiovisual procedures.

Treasury

Has established central audiovisual oversight office; developing facility consolidation plan.

SECTION II

MILITARY PROGRAMS

INTRODUCTION

No fewer than 10 separate studies have been made of Department of Defense audiovisual programs. Various recommendations have been developed and some have been acted upon. In spite of all the attention paid to audiovisual activities in DOD, various problems remain unsolved.

A 1974 report, prepared for the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, raised this question: "For a subject to have been studied so much with so little indication of progress raises the question: Why has the problem resisted such persistent efforts of management control?"

The answer, perhaps, rests in the perception of audiovisual support within DOD. Is audiovisual material so unique to each Major Command and local base commander as to preclude centralized management? Or, do audiovisual requirements constitute a single, overall support activity, requiring centralized management? It would seem that DOD has tried to introduce a form of central policy direction, while reserving for individual units the right to manage their own programs. This has resulted in a system where those charged with policy responsibility lack authority, while lower level personnel who make decisions often have limited accountability. The survey revealed as a major concern the inability of the military departments to complete training material in a timely fashion.

EXPENDITURES

Under existing reporting methods, it is difficult to determine just how much the Department of Defense spends each year on audiovisual programs.

The best estimate seems to be the $350-million figure developed for a DOD report in 1974. The $350-million was broken into three categories:

1) Products & Services $147-million
2) New Equipment $ 40-million
3) Salaries $163-million

DOD Audiovisual managers have questioned the $350-million figure, but offered no estimate of their own. Unofficially, several have said $350-million is probably accurate.

An examination of DOD expenditures is complicated by the military definition of audiovisual. Inclusion of such items as still pictures and material used in print media would appear to inflate expenditures, and include items not generally considered as audiovisual outside the military. On the other hand, there are substantial local base expenditures on films and videotapes which seem not to be included in reported figures. For example, a major audiovisual training program, which will have cost $84.9-million between 1971 and the end of FY78, is not included in overall figures.

On balance, it would appear that DOD does spend in the neighborhood of $350-million a year on what can be strictly defined as audiovisual programs.

For FY 76, DOD reported to OMB having produced 1,141 motion pictures, 3,560 separate television titles, and 3,412 audio and mixed media presentations. The DOD report failed to include one Army program which generated more than 2,000 T.V. titles.

As a result of numerous previous studies, DOD is making an effort to improve its audiovisual management, and to consolidate facilities. In some areas, there have been positive results. There are, however, several factors at work which limit what can be accomplished.

DAVA

The office currently responsible for setting DOD audiovisual policy is the Directorate for Audiovisual Activities, (DAVA), under the Armed Forces Information Service, in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs.

Audiovisual management in DOD has been shuffled between Assistant Secretaries, properly reflecting the subject as a hot potato. At present, there is no assurance that DAVA will remain under Public Affairs, nor is it clear that it belonged there in the first place.

The office is small, and has been cut back as a result of

DOD manpower ceilings. DAVA seems to have too few people and too few dollars to visit production facilities, systematically screen audiovisual products, or provide effective management.

DAVA is presently trying to implement a plan to consolidate service-wide production into three regional centers. The plan, as developed, would establish the Air Force Aerospace Audiovisual Service at Norton Air Force Base in California, the Army's Redstone Arsenal facility at Huntsville, Alabama and the Naval Photographic Center in Washington as Defense Audiovisual Support Activities (DAVSA's), charged with the responsibility of producing or contracting for all service-wide material to be shot primarily in their geographic areas. The plan, as initially drafted, set up two categories: material for service-wide use, which would go through the DAVSA's, and material for strictly local use, which could be done at the base level.

Simultaneously, the largest single Army user of audiovisual products proposed upgrading 19 videotape production facilities, with as many as 26 people at each. Cost figures have not been developed for the Army plan, but it would appear to be a multi-million dollar proposal. The proposal could shift a significant portion of Army training material out of the motion picture format, and out of private industry, into in-house videotape production. Such a shift might well result in renewed protests from private sector motion

picture producers.

In addition, the plan seems to be incompatible with the DAVA regional production scheme. In an attempt at compromise, DAVA has proposed a third audiovisual category, called "limited distribution", for material to be used by more than a single base, but less than an entire service.

Various service representatives have said they could, and would develop virtually all their material for "limited distribution", circumventing the DAVA plan.

They suggest this approach would render the regional plan ineffective, and enable major Military Commands to continue their current practices. If previous studies, including those done by DOD, are accurate in identifying the lack of central management as a major problem, the current compromise plan will not provide a solution.

It has been suggested that DAVA lacks sufficient authority to successfully implement a system of central management.

AIR FORCE

The Air Force management structure parallels that of DOD. There is a central office, in the Pentagon, charged with managing the overall program. However, budgets for the major Air Force production facility, located at Norton Air Force Base, are managed by a single Air Force Command. This takes a major management tool away from the Washington office. In addition, a large part of the Air Force audiovisual program consists of material produced at individual bases,

not susceptible to control from Washington.

The Air Force facility at Norton has more space than necessary to fulfill its mission. The equipment is old and outdated. It is presently owned and operated by the Air Force, a practice which has been criticized as conflicting with OMB's Circular A76, which says government should not compete with private industry.

There has been an attempt, in the Air Force, to implement regulations which require approval for service-wide audiovisual material by a central office. The result has been a decrease in material identified for service-wide distribution, an increase in designated local projects, and post-production efforts to upgrade the local project to service-wide distribution.

Another issue, raised by civilians employed by the Air Force in audiovisual production, is the charge that in recent years the quality of material has gone down as the number of military personnel has gone up.

THE ARMY

The Army maintains a government-owned, contractor-operated motion picture production facility at Redstone Arsenal in Alabama. However, much of the Army training material is done either on videotape, or in the TEC program, a major project consisting of 8mm film cassettes and audio tapes. The TEC program is managed by the Army Training Support Center, under the Training and Doctrine Command. Each training aid is carefully designed and evaluated. To date, the individual

items have been used less than the training designers would like, resulting in higher costs per viewing than anticipated.

Delays are encountered for training material done in a film format as a result of procedures which require approval by many parties at each stage of production.

What may be an extreme example was found in a series of training films titled "How to Fight". Given a high priority, the films were to explain the development of major new tactical approaches. The films were to be produced as the tactics were developed. Eight films were approved between July, 1974 and February, 1975. Contracts were negotiated for production of six of the films, for $229,200.37.

As of July 1, 1977, one film was on the way into the distribution system. A second film had been completed, and two were still in progress. Total contract production costs as of July 1 were $398,570.08. Three of the original eight films had been cancelled, after expenditures of $76,912.49. The remaining one was still being considered for completion on videotape, following a film production expenditure of $34,489.18. In all, by July 1, 1977, $619,476.66 had been spent on the original series of eight "How to Fight" films. In addition, an Army representative reported an expenditure of $123,000 to send tanks and a company of men from Fort Knox, Ky. to Camp Roberts, California for filming on the series. The film program was described, by an official responsible for Army audiovisual budgeting, as an embarrassment. The system, extraordinarily cumbersome,

includes a DOD level office setting policy, a one-man Army office implementing policy, another office providing funding, one major command in charge of certain production facilities, with yet another major command requesting the audiovisual material. Decentralization and delegation of responsibility results in frequent delays.

THE NAVY

The Naval Photographic Center provides contracting services for Navy-wide production, and production services for local material. Currently, the Photo Center is caught in a budget squeeze, which resulted, in December, 1977, in the commander threatening to wipe out the production division. This would have resulted in the Photo Center being unable to provide services anticipated by the DAVA regional center plan.

The Navy contracting process has resulted in delays and cost overruns in a substantial number of audiovisual products. It is estimated that it may take as long as three years from time of submission to completion of a Navy film. The NPC program is described as in a state of paralysis. One project examined for this review took more than six years from start to finish, increasing in price from $83,000 to $119,000. The nominal manager of the Navy program is a Lieutenant, working with one civilian assistant and a secretary, who clearly has neither the rank, nor the clout, to manage such a program. Navy audiovisual material screened ran the gamut from excellent, in the case of quite expensive information

films produced under contract to private industry; to poor, for training material done at small in-house Navy facilities. The Navy has contracted out for two or three major information films each year, at costs of well in excess of $100,000 per film.

DISTRIBUTION

Centralized distribution is badly needed for DOD audiovisual material. DOD is aware of the problem, and DAVA is attempting to create a central system. The Navy recently solicited bids for a study of its distribution needs. The $200,000 earmarked for the study, which would duplicate already completed Navy studies, would have been better spent, in the opinion of DAVA, on developing a prototype of the necessary hardware for a DOD-wide information system. The current lack of DOD audiovisual coordination can be seen by the fact that DAVA was unaware of the Navy's proposed distribution study until informed of it by this review.

RECOMMENDATIONS

DOD is considering recommendations to provide increased authority and additional resources to a central management office. Such an approach, building on the accomplishments to date, could result in establishment of an efficient DOD audiovisual system which allows for timely production of necessary training and information material.

SECTION III

CIVILIAN AGENCIES

CIVILIAN AGENCIES

SUMMARY

Civilian agencies use audiovisual material for:

1) Communication with the public,

2) Internal management information and training.

Communication with the public is done, primarily, through contracts to private industry. Internal communication is primarily accomplished through in-house production.

In both types of audiovisual production, there is a lack of clear guidelines and procedures. Authority is fragmented within departments and agencies, crossing lines between public affairs, administrative areas, personnel and training divisions, and program offices.

Centrally managed audiovisual offices often were found to do little more than rubber stamp projects developed in program areas. Attempts to establish control over individual audio-visual programs often have been unsuccessful because of what are described as "turf problems", a fight for control over the programs, and the often-expressed belief of program people that "it's our money".

In general, a primary problem with audiovisual material designed for the public is the failure to carefully target specific program-related information for an anticipated audience. The primary problem with internal communications programs is the proliferation of costly, under-staffed and under-utilized facilities.

EXPENDITURES

In FY 76, 18 major civilian agencies reported production to OMB of 1,215 motion pictures. Reporting procedures are such that there is no way of assuring the reliability of the figure, or attendant costs. In FY 76, the same 18 civilian agencies reported producing 1,870 television titles and 1,753 audio and mixed media presentations.

That the figures reported to OMB are incomplete can be seen in reports of two agencies. One agency reported expenditures for FY 76 of $140,000 on motion pictures, and television production amounting to $243,498, all under contract to private industry, for a total of $383,498. By going through the agency's procurement office, this review uncovered a total FY 76 expenditure of $734,297.12, nearly double that reported to OMB. The agency office responsible for reporting to OMB simply had no knowledge of the existence of motion pictures produced by another agency office.

A second agency reported motion picture expenditures for FY 76, to OMB, of $683,400, plus a few films done in-house, for which cost figures were not required. FY 76 expenditures were identified in this department of more than $2,000,000.

While there was no attempt to compile a comprehensive list of all civilian agency expenditures, and indeed, reporting systems are such that a list can not be compiled, the following are examples which indicate the scope of activity in representative agencies.

PERIOD	AGENCY	TYPE OF A-V	EXPENDITURE
FY 76	ADAMHA	Motion pictures & TV program grant	$1,222,748 (partial)
CY 71-77	AID, Bureau of Population & Humanitarian Assistance	Motion pictures for foreign program	$2,000,000 (estimated)
Jan '75 - Oct '77	ERDA	Motion pictures	$933,752
FY 77	HEW/NCCAN	4 training films/ 2 film strips	$394,229
FY 76	HEW (Women's Programs)	Various A-V, as major part of grants	$971,184
FY 76	HUD, (Policy Development & Research)	Motion pictures	$339,402.46
FY 76	IRS	Motion pictures & Audio	$344,886
FY 76-77	NASA	Motion pictures & distribution	$2,415,522 (estimated)
FY 76-77	National Park Service	Motion pictures	$2,789,564
FY 76-77	NOAA	Motion pictures & TV spots	$643,078
FY 74-76	Savings Bonds	Public Service Announcements	$647,548
CY 76	Social Security	Motion pictures & spots	$236,648
FY 78	Social Security	Radio Programs	$200,000 (budgeted)

There is no inventory of production facilities used for internal information and training. An attempt was made to develop such information in the departments studied. The lack of centralized department control over such facilities, and the lack of record keeping, made it virtually impossible. An earlier government study of the audiovisual field estimated that government, civilian and military, owned nearly $1-billion in equipment and facilities. The material gathered in the course of this review suggests that the total is now close to $2-billion. Much of the increase in the past two years appears to be in the civilian agencies.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

The justification for production of motion pictures, slide shows, filmstrips, etc. for public consumption rests in the requirement to inform the public about Government programs. Government audiovisual personnel argue that films, or other audiovisual formats, are a most effective way of communicating. There are, however, questions of who sees government audio-visual material, and relation between cost and size of audience.

While some films are targeted at specific audiences, such as older Americans, the business community, or local officials, most films are done for a general audience. Distribution is either through the government's National Audiovisual Center - for sales or rentals - through private industry

free-loan distributors which are paid by the showing, or through internal agency distribution systems.

Because of the limited available outlets for government films, and location of film libraries, government and private industry personnel involved in distribution agreed that the majority of government produced motion pictures are seen, primarily, by school children, mainly in the suburbs. Schools are in need of material, can be reached by distributors, and present relatively large numbers of people in one place, at one time. Government does little, if any, research into whether the needs of the students are being met by its films, or whether the government's needs are met by reaching students.

The majority of government films seem to run 28-and-a-half minutes. While this is an appropriate length for a half-hour television broadcast, surveys and opinions from private makers of educational films suggest it is too long for ideal classroom use. Limited television use, along with school needs, would seem to dictate shorter films. Greater care needs to be shown in targeting the audience, with film length determined by the needs of the intended viewer.

Similarly, government films are seen by civic associations, social clubs and special interest groups. Study of the limited reporting statistics available on distribution suggests, but does not prove, that the vast majority of Americans never see a government film. There is virtually nothing to indicate what those who have seen the films think of them.

Available distribution records further suggest that few government films are seen by more than two million people. A typical agency motion picture justification form might estimate distribution to a general audience of approximately 1,000,000, at a cost of more than $100,000.

Agency officials interviewed seemed not to have considered that $100 to reach 1,000 people is a comparatively expensive form of communications, or that the primary audience often consists of school children.

While it is difficult to draw a clear line between audiovisual productions which convey program information, and those which are pure public relations, a number of films were screened which appeared to be predominantly agency self-promotion. It is not uncommon to find a justification such as one, in writing, for a film currently being planned, which says: "Department will benefit through increased exposure to the public thereby improving image".

A substantial number of agencies have chosen to communicate with the public through television public service announcements (PSA's). The most common system for reporting use of PSA's depends on television stations returning post cards to the distributor or the agency. Only a small percentage of stations return such cards. Even when the cards are returned, agencies are forced to guess as to how many viewers saw the spot. Agency costs for public service announcements range from $5,000 to more than $25,000 per spot. There is frequently no relationship between cost and quality.

Some longer government films are distributed to television stations by free loan distributors. A study of distribution reports suggests that government films run primarily in small cities and towns, at fringe times, or on cable systems. Major stations, in major cities, seem not to run longer government films at all.

One department has, for some years, produced a weekly television series for distribution to stations in geographical areas served by the department's programs. A survey found that few major stations carry the program. A partial explanation was offered by one station representative who said, in commenting on quality and audience interest, that given a choice between the government-produced program and color-bar tests, he would run the color bars.

INTERNAL COMMUNICATION

Agencies were found to be following the same pattern as private industry in moving heavily into internally-produced videotape for employee training and management communications. Unlike industry, a general pattern of under-utilization was found. Industry must justify its studios on the basis of saving money for the company. This is not true in government.

In some departments, such as Justice and Labor, several bureaus have television studios in the same or adjacent buildings. Often, costly equipment has been purchased but goes unused due to unrealistic manpower ceilings.

In many cases, the facilities are quite elaborate. ERDA, now a part of the Department of Energy, is completing an expansion of a facility in Germantown, Maryland which represents an investment of nearly $700,000. The National Medical Audiovisual Center in Atlanta has approximately $2,000,000 worth of television equipment but is prohibited from fully utilizing the equipment for production by the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine. The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, at Brunswick, Georgia, has acquired approximately $1,000,000 worth of audiovisual equipment for training.

More common is the small studio, with two fixed cameras, or portable equipment. Since equipment is arriving virtually every week (half a dozen facilities were visited where employees were in the process of unpacking new cameras and videotape recorders) it is impossible to develop an accurate count of the number of government television studios in the Washington area. In addition, there are a number of agencies which have set up studios in regional centers such as Atlanta, Denver, and San Francisco. Scattered utilization reports indicate the majority of these studios are in use less than one-half of the time, many less than one-third. There is no evidence of inter-departmental coordination.

Television studios are organized under training offices, administrative offices and personnel offices. There appear to be few people with professional production experience involved in the operation of the studios. As a result, equipment often

has little relationship to the required production. For example, one agency, with a need to videotape outside a studio, purchased and equipped a mobile van, requiring linking cameras to the van with coaxial or triaxial cables. The need to cable into a location restricts the mobility desired by the agency. At a fraction of the cost, the agency could have purchased portable equipment and achieved the necessary flexibility.

There is a fairly consistent pattern of equipment purchases, and general audiovisual production, done at the end of the Fiscal Year, with money left in agency budgets. The clearest, most straight-forward example, was found in an agency where the Public Affairs officer acknowledged stockpiling proposals during the year, for varying costs, to provide a selection for the agency head who asked, "What do you have that might cost x-number of dollars before we have to turn back the money?"

One other clear trend emerged in the study of civilian agency audiovisual production. Identify a subject which receives major attention in the media, such as civil rights, the environment, women's lib, or energy, and government-produced material will follow about a year behind, just the length of time it takes to turn out the film, tape, filmstrip or slide show. Many of the audiovisual products viewed had little relation to the producing agency's program responsibility in such subject areas, but presented an overall agency view of the subject, often placed in an historical context.

The question suggested by such material is whether government is informing the public about its programs, or serving as some sort of self-appointed publicly-financed supplement to the communications media, providing an "official view" of current events?

SECTION IV

PROCUREMENT

PROCUREMENT

One problem which is shared by military and civilian agencies is procurement of audiovisual products.

The current system has been acknowledged by government and private industry as a major source of irritation and confusion, often leading to inferior products.

A series of meetings with representatives of the private motion picture industry made it clear that the current procurement methods put an extraordinary burden on private industry, and result either in inferior products or inflated costs to government, or both. Detailed studies of bids and contract awards demonstrated major problems for both sides.

Recommendations were developed in August of 1973 for a single, unified, government-wide procurement system for motion pictures. In August of 1976, a system was proposed which met with wide-spread opposition both from government and private industry. In July of 1977, a revised motion picture procurement system was published by the OMB Office of Federal Procurement Policy, and hearings were held in November.

The general reaction was that the proposed system, while far superior to the earlier version, had a few flaws.

Basically, the OFPP proposal would establish an open list of qualified producers, wishing to produce government films. A managing agency would rotate the list, assuring every qualified producer an opportunity to bid on a specific

government job. An agency desiring a motion picture would secure the five names then at the top of the list, supplement the five with two others of its choice from the list, if desired, and solicit bids on the job. Industry comments centered on the need to expand the system to include more than motion pictures, and suggestions that the list be broken into categories of motion picture specialties, rather than a single list for all types of motion pictures.

As of April, 1978, OFPP was reviewing the comments and the proposed motion picture procurement system, and hoped to issue a final circular by August.

SECTION V

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Measured against any standard, government production of audiovisual material is big business.

Agencies spend an estimated $500-million a year on all aspects of audiovisual activity. For comparison purposes, that is:

- More than the current proposed appropriation for foreign military assistance.
- Just about as much as a proposed Federal grant program for local governments to insulate schools, hospitals and homes of the poor.
- More than double the amount proposed to help rehabilitate homes in older neighborhoods.
- Nearly half the entire budget for the Department of State.

The estimate of yearly expenditures of $500-million is conservative. It is substantially lower than a preliminary estimate of $632,300,000 for calendar 1977 by "The Hope Reports", a private industry publication.

Reporting procedures have been such that government has not been able to identify total annual audiovisual expenditures with any precision. There has been no accurate record of how many films or videotapes are in circulation. There has been no inventory of existing in-house government television studios. There has been no consistent government-wide system of approving or reporting audiovisual production. There is no

single procurement system, no consistent way of evaluating private industry proposals, no single catalogue, and no requirement for evaluation of material produced.

While some government produced audiovisual material has been useful, and some good quality products have been obtained at reasonable costs, there are other examples which raise serious management questions:

- A government agency produced a 30-minute BiCentennial film, under contract to a major Hollywood motion picture company, at a cost of $454,463. The agency estimated 500,000 people have seen the film. By comparison, although there are obvious differences in purpose and budgeting, the average cost of one episode of a regularly scheduled half-hour prime-time commercial network television program in the 1977-78 season was $177,000; $363,000 for a one-hour program. The average network television program was seen by an estimated 30-million people.

  QUESTION: Was the anticipated audience for the Government film large enough to justify the cost?

- In 1975, a contract was signed by a military command for production of a training film, at a cost of $37,000. By August, 1977, the film had been revised six times, following approval of nine different script versions, and a finished product had yet to reach the field. The cost had escalated to $150,000.

QUESTION: Could proper planning have avoided the need for revision, and increase in price, and resulted in a more timely completion of the film?

- An increasing number of agencies are establishing video production facilities. Often, three or four bureaus or agencies within a single department have separate studios, sometimes in the same building. Many of the facilities are in use less than one-third of the time. There is little sharing of facilities among agencies. Often, money to purchase equipment comes out of unrelated program budgets, or from quickly-spent funds at the end of the Fiscal Year.

QUESTION: Are controls on establishment of government video facilities adequate to prevent a proliferation of underutilitzed facilities?

- In the past three Fiscal Years, a military department's chaplain service has spent $1,963,718.45 on motion pictures. Eighteen films were produced, under contract, at a cost of $990,802; existing motion pictures were purchased for $972,916.45. Many of the films are geared toward personal counseling. The combined output of the other two military departments for chaplains films is a fraction of that amount, and represents almost exclusively off-the-shelf purchases.

QUESTION: If the chaplain's services in two military

departments find little need for producing original films, might the other department not find it possible to meet its needs with existing films?

- An agency proposed a series of television Public Service Announcements, to be done in the Vietnamese and Laotian languages. The agency goal was to reach 250 people in a moderate-sized city. The proposal reached the departmental level before anyone considered whether a television station would run such foreign language announcements, or whether the desired audience would be watching television.

  QUESTION: Did the responsible agency official have an adequate understanding of the uses of television?

- A military department currently experiences a 26-month wait between requests for routine training films and the time the films go into distribution. Often, the waiting-time reaches three years.

  QUESTION: Why does it take so long to turn out necessary items, and, is the lack of timely response adversely effecting training?

- A program office spent $394,000 for a series of four training films and two filmstrips. In the first year of distribution, an estimated 12,000 people saw parts of the training material. The cost to the agency was, therefore, $32.83 per viewer.

QUESTION: Considering the size of the audience, could the same information have been delivered in a less expensive format?

- An agency spent $125,000 on a motion picture, but has lost track of the film. There is no record of where the film went, or whether anyone saw it. Another agency produced a film for $120,000, but made only 16 prints. At the end of the first year of distribution, the film had been shown 139 times. No records were kept of audience size, but each showing cost $836.30, based on production cost.

QUESTION: Did the two agencies involved need motion pictures?

- Films by two military departments, on the subject of espionage, released in November, 1976 and February, 1977, use dramatic approaches so similar they could have been created by the same writer. One film cost $70,000 to produce, the other more than $100,000. A third military department currently has approval to produce a film or videotape on the same subject. The script utilizes the same dramatic situations as the first two. A Defense Agency has a videotape in production which covers the same ground. All four items update no fewer than twenty-two audiovisual products on the subject in the Defense Audiovisual Information System, a newly developed, computerized, catalogue.

QUESTION: Is this duplication necessary?

- An agency proposed spending $4.5-million on audio-visual equipment for a one-shot training effort. The proposal included plans for a $100,000 television studio and purchase of 22,000 tape recorders and projectors, at a cost of $ 2.3-million. Following the conclusion of the training program, the agency intended to put some equipment in storage, and surplus the rest.

QUESTION: Does such a limited use justify an investment of this amount in equipment? Could the agency have gone to private industry for services, rather than buying equipment, using it briefly, and then getting rid of it?

The above examples suggest there is a pattern of waste and questionable procedures in government's management of audiovisual programs. Not enough thought seems to be given to whether audiovisual material is the best means of communicating a particular body of information. Results frequently are measured in terms of awards, with little evidence that the product has reached the desired audience. Often, agencies propose to develop a motion picture, or filmstrip, for a general audience. Available distribution reports suggest that, more often than not, the audience which sees the film consists primarily of school children, generally in suburban

areas. While agencies cite a requirement for informing the public as to their programs and activities as the justification for most audiovisual production, it is not clear whether distribution to suburban school children represents satisfactory dissemination of information.

While there is little doubt that audiovisual material can play an important role in government's necessary communication with the public, evidence uncovered in the course of this review suggests that improved management procedures are necessary to assure that tax dollars are being wisely spent, and the resulting products are carefully planned, properly executed, and distributed to an audience which benefits from the information.

Some government audiovisual people have suggested that their productions should motivate, pointing to the great documentary motion pictures done by government in the 1930's by people such as Pare Lorentz. Some government films in recent years have been designed to motivate the public, particularly those films in the environmental area.

It is suggested, however, that there are major differences between the 1930's and the late 1970's. It would be difficult to find a subject for a government-produced documentary which has not been treated by network television programs such as CBS's "60 Minutes". Similarly, subjects of current national interest often are dealt with by

the motion picture industry in the form of full length feature films. Local television newscasts often present extended film and videotape examinations of current issues. Whether such material is well executed, or whether it presents a government point of view, is not the issue. If major government motivational material springs from issues currently being addressed by the communications media, it would seem difficult to justify expenditures of public funds to duplicate existing production.

While there are those who decry the decline of government motivational films, there are others who feel a better current use of audiovisual media by government is in communicating information on specific programs and services provided by government.

There are many examples of successfully designed and well-utilized government audiovisual programs. The Office of Education has produced a motion picture dealing with educational opportunities for women which has been widely distributed and, apparently, well received. An Army program designed to teach specialized occupational skills with individualized, self-paced audiovisual instructional modules has been tested and found to significantly raise student test scores. A number of excellent motion pictures are seen in National Parks. What is needed is a major effort to make certain that all government audiovisual production is subjected to rigorous justification procedures, to assure that the recommended format is appropriate

for the material, to make certain that a specific audience is targeted, to carefully monitor costs,to assure adequate distribution, and to assure the taxpayer that all government audiovisual communication is as effective as the examples cited.

SECTION VI

FACILITY INVENTORY

AND

FILMS SCREENED

CIVILIAN AGENCY
PRODUCTION FACILITIES

	VIDEOTAPE CAPABILITY	FILM EQUIPMENT	LIBRARY
ACTION			
Headquarters, Washington, D.C.	X		X
Regions (10)	X		
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
Office of the Secretary (Personnel)	X		
Bureau of the Census, Suitland, Maryland	X		
Jeffersonville, Indiana	X	X	
Maritime Administration, Washington, D.C.	X		
Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N.Y.	X		
Regions (7)	X		
National Bureau of Standards, Gaithersburg, Maryland	X	X	
Boulder, Colorado	X		
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Rockville, Maryland	X		X
Boulder, Colorado	X		
Regions/Field	(Multiple video and film capability)		
Patent and Trademark Office, Arlington, Virginia	X		
Office of Telecommunications, Washington, D.C.	X		
Boulder, Colorado	X		

	VIDEOTAPE CAPABILITY	FILM EQUIPMENT	LIBRARY
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY			
Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois	X	X	
Bureau of Reclamation			
Engineering & Research, Denver, Colorado	X		
Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, N.Y.	X		
Fermi National Accelerator			
Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois	X		
Gaithersburg Building, Gaithersburg, Maryland	X	X	
Idaho Operations Office, Idaho Falls, Idaho	X		
Los Alamos Scientific			
Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico	X	X	
Morgantown Energy Research			
Center, Morgantown, West Virginia	X		
Nevada Operations Office, Las Vegas, Nevada	X		
Oak Ridge Gaseous Diffusion			
Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee	X		
Oak Ridge Library, Oak Ridge, Tennessee			X
Oak Ridge Nuclear			
Division (Y-12), Oak Ridge, Tennessee	X	X	
Oak Ridge Operations, Oak Ridge, Tennessee		X	
Paducah Gaseous Diffusion			
Plant, Paducah, Kentucky	X		
Pittsburgh Energy Research			
Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	X		
Portsmouth Area Office, Piketon, Ohio	X		

	VIDEOTAPE CAPABILITY	FILM EQUIPMENT	LIBRARY
Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington	X		
Rockwell Hanford Operations, Richland, Washington	X		
Sandia Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico	X	X	
Savannah River Operations Office, Aiken, South Carolina	X		
University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.	X		
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE			
Food and Drug Administration, Bureau of Radiological Health, Rockville, Maryland	X		
Office of Professional and Consumer Affairs, Rockville, Maryland (Being dismantled.)	X		
HEW Headquarters (South Portal Studio) Washington, D.C.	X	X	
National Institutes of Health Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke, Bethesda, Maryland	X		
National Institutes of Health Medical Arts and Photography Division, Bethesda, Maryland	X	X	
National Institutes of Health Office of Information, Bethesda, Maryland		X	

	VIDEOTAPE CAPABILITY	FILM EQUIPMENT	LIBRARY
National Institute of Mental Health			
Technical Services Branch, Rockville, Maryland	X	X	
National Medical Audiovisual			
Center, Atlanta, Georgia	X	X	X
Office of Education FOB-6,			
Washington, D.C. (Proposed)	X		
Social Security Administration, Baltimore, Maryland	X	X	
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT			
Training Division, Washington, D.C.	X		
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, Oregon	X		
Bureau of Indian Affairs, Brigham, Utah		X	X
Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado	X		
Montana	X		
Bureau of Mines, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania			X
Bureau of Outdoor			
Recreation, Washington, D.C.	X		
Bureau of Reclamation, E & R			
Center, Denver, Colorado	4 Divisions		
Regions	3		
Mining Enforcement and Safety			
Administration, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	X	X	
National Park Service			
Harpers Ferry, West Virginia		X	X

	VIDEOTAPE CAPABILITY	FILM EQUIPMENT	LIBRARY
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C.	X	X	
Regions	7 Offices with video capabilities and libraries		
U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia			X
Denver, Colorado	X		
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
Office of Management and Finance			
Visual Communications Section, Washington, D.C.	X		
Attorney General's Advocacy Institute, Washington, D,C,	X		
Bureau of Prisons, Washington, D.C.	X		
Drug Enforcement Administration, Washington, D.C.	X	X	X
Federal Bureau of Investigation, Quantico, Virginia	X	X	
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Washington, D.C.	X		
U.S. Marshal's Service, Washington, D.C.	X		
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
Administration and Management, Washington, D.C.	X		
Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C.	X		
Employment and Training, Washington, D.C.	X		
Employment Standards, Washington, D.C.	X		
Labor Management Services Administration, Washington, D.C.	X		

	VIDEOTAPE CAPABILITY	FILM EQUIPMENT	LIBRARY
Office of Information, Publications and Reports, Washington, D.C.	X		
OSHA Training, Washington, D.C. (To be Moved to Chicago, Illinois)	X		
OSHA Public Information, Washington, D.C.	X		
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION			
Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California		X	X
Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland		X	X
Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center, Houston, Texas	X	X	X
John F. Kennedy Space Center, Kennedy Space Center, Florida	X	X	X
Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia		X	X
Lewis Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio		X	X
George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Alabama	X	X	X
DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C.	X	X	
Arlington, Virginia	X		
Foreign Service Institute, Arlington, Virginia	X		

	VIDEOTAPE CAPABILITY	FILM EQUIPMENT	LIBRARY
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Coast Guard, Washington, D.C.	X	X	X
Regions	(Multiple video, film and library facilities)		
FAA Headquarters			
Plans and Audio Visuals, Washington, D.C.	X	X	X
Office of Personnel, Washington, D.C.	X		
Office of Management Systems, Washington, D.C.	X		
Air Traffic Control, Washington, D.C.	X		
FAA Aeronautical Center			
Television and Motion Picture Section, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	X	X	X
Civil Aeromedical Institute, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	X	X	
FAA Management Training School, Lawton, Oklahoma	X		
FAA National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center, Atlantic City, New Jersey	X		
FAA Field Operations	76 Offices with video capabilities		
Federal Highway Administration	X	X	X
National Highway Safety Administration, Washington, D.C.		X	X
Office of the Secretary of Transportation, Washington, D.C.		X	X
Transportation Systems Center, Cambridge, Mass.	X		

	VIDEOTAPE CAPABILITY	FILM EQUIPMENT	LIBRARY
Transportation Test Center, Pueblo, Colorado	X	X	
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY			
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, Glynco, Georgia	X		
Internal Revenue Service, Arlington, Virginia	X		
U.S. Customs Office, Washington, D.C.	X		
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION			
Federal Protective Service, Washington, D.C.	X		
Federal Preparedness Agency, Washington, D.C. and Field	X		
Federal Supply Service, Arlington, Virginia	X		
National Archives and Records Service, Washington, D.C.	X		
Johnson Library, Texas	X	X	
Office of Administration, Washington, D.C.	X		
Regions	20 Offices with video capabilities		

Films Screened -- Summary Data

Total number of films screened:		Civilian	127
		Military	83
		Total screened:	210
Total number of films screened with production costs identified:		Civilian	124
		Military	71
		Total screened with costs:	195
Total production costs of films screened:	124	Civilian	$6,085,691
	71	Military	3,044,933
		Total production costs 195 films:	$9,130,624

Note: "Purpose" Column in attached listings represents the Study Group's judgment of the overall impression conveyed by each film.

FILMS SCREENED

CIVILIAN AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT	TITLE	COST	PURPOSE
Action	A Gift of Time	$ 25,000	Public Awareness
	A Personal Experience: Peace Corps in Ecuador	$ 17,000	Public Awareness, Program Information
	Peace Corps in Africa	$ 16,500	Program Information
	There for the Asking	$ 42,800	Public Awareness Program Information
	Vista Makes the Difference	$ 64,100	Public Awareness, Program Information
AID	To Change Your Life	$ 50,000	Program Information
	To The People	$ 50,000	Program Information
AID/NASA	Series of three plus Introductory Film:	$487,931	Program Sell
	If One Today, Two Tomorrow	(total cost	
	Survival	of 4 films)	
	Images of Life		
Commerce	Factfinder for the Nation	$ 67,000	Public Awareness
	Showroom to the World	$ 7,000	Program Sell
	In the Wake of Heritage	$ 47,500	Historical
	Double-Edged Sword	$ 23,000	Problem Awareness Public Awareness

DEPARTMENT	TITLE	COST	PURPOSE
Commerce (Cont)	Hurricane Decision	$ 35,000	Problem Awareness, Public Awareness
	Estuary	$ 46,600	Public Awareness
	It's Your Coast	$ 34,000	Public Awareness
	Standards for Excellence	$ 47,000	Public Awareness, P.R.
	GATE	$ 50,000	Program Information, P.R.
	Investigations into Aquaspace	$ 48,000	Program Information, P.R.
	Overview: The Great American Fish Story (five films)	$125,000 (total cost of 5 films)	P.R. for the Fish Industry
	Sponge Treasures From the Sea	$ 13,000	Public Awareness
	Outdoor Fish Cookery	$ 12,000	Public Awareness
	See More of America	$ 44,425	Promotion
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	An Investment of Protect	N. A.	Public Information
	Safety in EPA	$ 32,000	Internal Management
	Jet Roar	$ 44,000	Public Awareness
	The Great Clean-up	$ 92,500 (EPA share)	Public Information, Public Awareness
	The Gifts	$ 68,000	Motivational

DEPARTMENT	TITLE	COST	PURPOSE
ERDA	Energy: The American Experience	$ 29,000	Problem Awareness
	Challenge of the Future	$ 30,000	Problem Awareness
	The Park	$ 17,000	Program Awareness Agency Identification
	Energy Saving Homes	$ 2,500	Program Information
	Orshansky Transmission	$ 2,500	Program Information, Agency P.R.
	Solar Collector	$ 2,500	Program Information
	Energy Cooperation	$ 2,500	Program Information
	Tomorrow's Cars	$ 2,500	Program Information
	Da Vinci	$ 2,500	Program Information
	Solar School	$ 2,500	Program Information
	New House for Tomorrow	$ 2,500	Program Information
	Environmental Studies	$ 2,500	Program Information
	Synthetic Leaf	$ 2,500	Program Information
	Crash Test	$ 2,000	Program Information
	Enhanced Oil Recovery	$ 2,500	Program Information
	Underground Coal Gasification	$ 2,500	Program Information
	Converting Coal to Gas	$ 2,500	Program Information
	Geothermal, Nature's Boiler	$ 7,000	Program Information
	Sun Power for Farms	$ 22,000	Program Information, with USDA
Federal Energy Administration	Reserved for Tomorrow	$ 21,000	Problem Awareness, Public Awareness
	When the Circuit Breaks	$125,000	Problem Awareness Public Awareness

DEPARTMENT	TITLE	COST	PURPOSE
GSA	Conquering the Paper Mountain	$152,000	Public Information, P.R.
HEW	Right to Read	$125,000	Problem Awareness, Program Awareness
	Environmental Education	$114,000	Problem Awareness Public Awareness
	Where I Want to Be	$ 33,000	Problem Awareness, Public Awareness
	To Begin a Child	$ 37,000	Public Awareness
	The Woman's Game	$ 98,000	Public Awareness
	Don't Stop the Music	$ 8,772 (partial)	Program Awareness
	Child Abuse Series of Four Films	$394,000 (total cost of four films)	Problem Awareness
	Read Label, Set Better Table	$100,000	Program Information
	After Our Baby Died	$ 54,000	Program Information
	Jenny is a Good Thing	$ 48,500	Program Information, Agency P.R.
	Code Blue	$ 55,000	Health Recruit Program
	Cuckoo's Nest Revisisted	$ 90,000 (HEW share)	Public Broadcast
HUD	A Matter of Independence	$ 10,000	Program Information, Research
	Renovations, Inovations	$ 34,948	Program Information, Research

DEPARTMENT	TITLE	COST	PURPOSE
HUD (Cont)	No Place to Rest His Head	$120,000	Program Information, Public Awareness, Research
Interior	Indivisibly One	$ 73,000	Public Information Department P.R.
Bureau of Indian Affairs:	Tell Them About Us	$ 30,000	Program Information
	That They May Learn	$ 28,000	Program Information
Bureau of Land Management:	Dapples and Grays	$ 25,000	Program Information, Problem Information
Bureau of Mines:	Wealth Out of Waste	$ 22,210	Program Information, Agency P.R.
	Lead in Motion	Cost to Gov't of distrib. only	Promotional
	Shield Supports for Longwall Coal Mining	$ 34,000	Research
Bureau of Reclamation:	Miracle of Water	$ 25,000	Program Information, Agency P.R.
	Of Time and A River	$ 50,000	Program Information, Agency P.R.
Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration:	Safety in Longwall Mining	$ 30,000	Safety Training
	Truck Haulage Safety	$ 20,900	Safety Training
National Park Service:	Independence	$454,463	History
	The Americans, 1776	$292,833	History

DEPARTMENT	TITLE	COST	PURPOSE
National Park Service (Cont)	The Extraordinary Creation	$ 37,192	History
	Winter Encampment, 1779-1780	$ 46,634	History
	Seige of Fort Stanwix	$ 95,399	History
	Jamestown	$ 16,412	History
	Age of Alaska	$ 70,490	Nature
	Capulin Mountain	$ 27,500	Nature
	Mt. McKinley, The Land Eternal	$ 44,147	Nature
	California Gray Whale	$ 19,588	Nature
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service:	A Great White Bird	$ 52,000	Program Information, Nature
	To Strike the Balance	$ 16,045	Public Information
U.S. Geological Survey:	Kiluea 1959	--------	Nature
	Belize Barrier Reef	$ 5,000	Research
Justice	Your FBI	$ 32,000	Program Information, Agency P.R.
NASA	Partners With Industry	$ 27,000	Agency P.R.
	4 Rms, Earth View	$ 55,000	Program Information
	Down to Earth	$ 36,000	Program Information
	Mars - The Search Begins	$ 75,000	Program Information, Science
	STARPHAC	$ 42,600	Program Information

DEPARTMENT	TITLE	COST	PURPOSE
NASA (Cont)	Meals From Space	$ 17,600	Program Information
	Universe	$127,000	Science (Astronomy)
	To Preserve a Legacy	$ 8,910	Public Awareness, Agency Identification
	Shuttle Astronaut Recruiting	$ 855	Recruiting
	Shaping Tomorrow	$ 21,500	Recruiting
	ASSESS	$ 20,778	Technical
	Increased Gravity Experiment	$ 6,000	Technical
	Shuttle Parachute Refurbishment	$ 5,460	Technical
State	Foreign Policy History - series of four films	$289,846 (total cost of four films)	Historical
Transportation	Flight 52	$141,000	Program Awareness, Agency P.R.
	Highways of History	$ 9,000	History, P.R.
FAA	In Celebration of Flight	$ 55,000	History
	Profile Descent	$ 20,000	Program Information, Public Awareness
	Microwave Landing Systems	$ 37,000	Program Information, Public Awareness
	Aloft	$ 10,000	Agency P.R.
	Laying Continuous Welding Rails	$ 253	Training

DEPARTMENT	TITLE	COST	PURPOSE
Treasury	Hey, We're in Business	$107,000	Program Information
	An American Partnership	$ 48,000	Program Support
	A Simple Matter of Deduction	$ 28,000	Program Support

FILMS SCREENED

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT (Branch)	TITLE	COST	PURPOSE
Defense	Not For Ourselves Alone	$ 67,000	Public Information, P.R.
Air Force:	Mechanical Aptitude	$ 23,340	Education and Training
	Spanning Spectrum	$ 23,894	Education and Training
	Sustained High G Tolerance	$ 48,903	Education and Training
	Thunderbirds, A.F. Now	N.A.	Internal Information
	Tactical Air Control System	$ 79,456	Internal Information, Education
	What Can I Do Now?	N.A.	Internal Information
	Air Force Now #75	$ 83,083	Internal Information, Morale
	Air Force Now #80	$100,163	Internal Information, Morale
	Air Force Now #94	$ 60,241	Internal Information, Morale
	Air Force Now #96	$ 52,494	Internal Information, Morale
	Air Force Now #97	$ 67,303	Internal Information, Morale
	Reserved - Labor Day	$ 4,218	P.R.
	Torrence Parade	$ 13,351	P.R.

DEPARTMENT (Branch)	TITLE	COST	PURPOSE
Air Force (Cont)	Air Force Men and Women	$ 44,148	Internal Information
	Rapid Runway Repair Procedures	$ 38,686	Internal Education
	* A Night on Jackrabbit Mesa (1967)	---------	Internal Information
	* Battle of Khe Sanh (1968)	---------	Internal Information
	* Time and Tide (1967)	---------	Internal Education
	* Man on the Hot Seat (1968)	---------	Training
	* Here There Are Tigers (1968)	---------	Internal Education
	* The Blood Brothers (1967)	---------	Internal Education
	* AARK (1969)	---------	Internal Education
	E 3 A Tactical Test	$ 39,173	Internal Information
	Counterpoise; Defense Against Espionage	$105,225	Internal Information
	Women, The New Dimension in Aerospace	$ 44,140	Education and Training
	A 10	$ 10,124 (partial)	Congressional Report

* Denotes seven (7) films made prior to 1970.
Costs neither readily available nor applicable.

-19-

DEPARTMENT (Branch)	TITLE	COST	PURPOSE
Army:	Leadership - Male/Female	$ 19,357	Education
	Leadership - Male/Female	$ 13,317	Education
	Covert Deception	$ 36,991	Education
	Civilian and Geneva Convention	$ 66,718	Education
	Scatterable Mines	$ 23, 679	Education
	ECCM Techniques	$ 47,708	Education
	Merry Go Round Isn't Forever	$ 51,146	Education
	Espionage Target: U.S. Army	$ 70,000	Education
	Uniform Code of Military Justice	$105,055	Education
	Army Total Force	$ 52,133	Internal Information
	Have Your Say	$ 54,310	Internal Information
	How to Fight	$ 65,121	Internal Information
	9 AFRTS Spots	$ 6,000 each	Internal Information, P.R.
	A Real Challenge	$ 51,585	Recruiting, P.R.
	Food Service Specialist	$ 54,395	Recruiting
	Challenge of Air Defense	$ 57,919	Recruiting
	Army Communications	$ 52,153	Recruiting
	Rape Prevention, Part III	$ 50,000	Education
	Modern Battle	$150,000	Education

DEPARTMENT (Branch)	TITLE	COST	PURPOSE
Army TEC Lessons	Green Tabbers	$ 35,544*	Training
	Target Engagement at Night	$ 35,544*	Training
	Operation of Squad Radio	$ 35,544*	Training
	Servicing Tank Air Cleaner	$ 35,544*	Training
	Introduction to TEC	$ 35,544*	Training
	Fire Direction Computer	$ 35,544*	Training
	Preparing the Tow	$ 35,544*	Training
	Fundamentals of Leadership	$ 35,544*	Training
	Lance Missile	$ 35,544*	Training
	Signal Identification	$ 35,544*	Training
	Target Engagement	$ 35,544*	Training
	Masking	$ 35,544*	Training

Army estimate of cost.

DEPARTMENT (Branch)	TITLE	COST	PURPOSE
Navy:	Guns and Ships	$ 27,300	Internal Information
	Occluded Fronts	$ 38,424	Internal Information
	Doing Spain	$ 26,000	Internal Information
	Why Electric Fuze	$ 43,000	Internal Information, Education
	Update: P 3 C	$ 41,485	Internal Information, P.R.
	Gathering of Men and Ships	$153,324	Internal and Public Information, P.R.
	Heritage and Horizons	$130,246	Internal and Public Information, P.R.
	Lifestyle	$ 22,500	Internal Information, P.R.
	CNO Sitrep #11	$ 21,459	Internal Information
	Salute to Maritime Nations	$ 25,000	P.R.
	Making an Occupied Bed	$ 12,500	Training
	It's Your Navy	$ 30,797	Education
	MK 48 Torpedo	$ 47,000	Internal Information

DEPARTMENT (Branch)	TITLE	COST	PURPOSE
Marines:	The 11th Hour	N.A.	Internal Information
	Supporting Arms, Air Support	N.A.	Internal Education
	The Birthday Party	N.A.	Internal Information, P.R.
	The Gifts	$ 18,841	Internal Information

FORM OT-29
(3-73)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

	1. PUBLICATION OR REPORT NO.	2. Gov't Accession No.	3. Recipient's Accession No.

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

Summary of Findings and Recommendations on Federal Audiovisual Activities

5. Publication Date

April 1978

6. Performing Organization Code

7. AUTHOR(S)

Robert Lissit, Charles Coates, Nancy Greene, Jane Lange, Audrey Rasmussen

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS

9. Project Task Work Unit No.

10. Contract Grant No.

TP7AC019

11. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address

Office of Telecommunications Policy
1800 G Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

12. Type of Report and Period Covered

13.

14. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

15. ABSTRACT *(A 200-word or less factual summary of most significant information. If document includes a significant bibliography or literature survey, mention it here.)*

The report summarizes the results of a study of audiovisual programs in 16 departments and independent agencies, and the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

16. Key Words *(Alphabetical order, separated by semicolons)*

Audiovisual activities

17. AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

[X] UNLIMITED.

[ ] FOR OFFICIAL DISTRIBUTION.

18. Security Class *(This report)*	20. Number of pages
Unclassified	77
19. Security Class *(This page)*	**21. Price:**
Unclassified	

USCOMM-DC 29716-P73